

others that I had already submitted and that the problem would be likely to remain unsolved for years. I therefore decided (Dubois, 1984) simply to follow the Code in this case. Experience shows that this may be the quickest and most efficient course; nevertheless I am grateful to Smith & Wake for raising this case now.

Additional references

- Castanet, J. & Guyétant, R. (Eds.). 1989. *Atlas de répartition des amphibiens et reptiles de France*. 191 pp. Société Herpétologique de France, Paris.
- Delauger, M. & Cheylan, M. 1992. *Atlas de répartition des batraciens et reptiles de Corse*. 128 pp. Parc Naturel Régional de Corse et École Pratique des Hautes Etudes.

Comments on the proposed conservation of *Lycognathophis* Boulenger, 1893 (Reptilia, Serpentes)

(Case 2877; see BZN 51: 330–331)

(1) Hidetoshi Ota

Tropical Biosphere Research Center and Department of Biology, University of the Ryukyus, Nishihara, Okinawa 903-1, Japan

I am in full support of the proposal to conserve the name *Lycognathophis* Boulenger, 1893 by suppressing *Scopelophis* Fitzinger, 1843. The latter name has not been used even since Dowling (1990) pointed out its priority. Although Dowling implied that *Lycognathophis* had been little used, it has actually been employed for over a century for *L. seychellensis* (Schlegel, 1837), the only endemic snake in the Seychelles. The resurrection of *Scopelophis* would be seriously confusing both to snake systematists and to biogeographers of the Seychelles.

(2) Ronald A. Nussbaum

Department of Herpetology, Museum of Zoology, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48109-1079, U.S.A.

Conservation of *Lycognathophis* Boulenger, 1893 is fully justified; the alternative name *Scopelophis* Fitzinger, 1843 was published without any diagnosis and has not been used at all. In reviving *Scopelophis*, Dowling described the name *Lycognathophis* as being misleading, since it implies that this natricine snake is a lycodontine, but this has no bearing: many generic names are misleading to some extent.

(3) Edmond V. Malnate

The Academy of Natural Sciences of Philadelphia, 19th and the Parkway, Logan Square, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19103, U.S.A.

I urge the Commission to accept this application. To my knowledge the species involved has not been associated with any generic name other than *Lycognathophis*. Fitzinger's name clearly has priority but the issue is stability of nomenclature; under Article 79c of the Code an exception to priority is warranted.

(4) Support for the application has also been received from Professor Edwin L. Bell (*Albright College, Reading, Pennsylvania 19612-5234, U.S.A.*) and Drs A. Dale

Belcher (*Albuquerque Biological Park, Albuquerque, New Mexico 87102, U.S.A.*), Donald G. Broadley (*The Natural History Museum, Centenary Park, Selborne Avenue, Bulawayo, Zimbabwe*), Joseph T. Collins (*The University of Kansas Natural History Museum, Lawrence, Kansas 66045-2454, U.S.A.*) and Raymond F. Laurent (*Fundación Lillo, Miguel Lillo 251, 4000 Tucumán, Argentina*).

Comments on the proposed conservation of some mammal generic names first published in Brisson's (1762) *Regnum Animale*

(Case 2928; see BZN 51: 135-146, 266-267, 342-348; 52: 78-93)

(1) Mary R. Dawson

The Carnegie Museum of Natural History, 4400 Forbes Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15213-4080, U.S.A.

I write with regard to the application for the conservation of 11 generic names first published by Brisson (1762). I concur with the view so well expressed by Anthea Gentry in the case that, although the work by Brisson is rejected, the names listed have very well established usage and should be conserved as the approved generic names for these mammals. I hope the application succeeds. It would be foolish to replace those well understood names.

My direct interest is especially strong in the cases of *Glis* and *Tragulus*, as I have worked with fossil relatives of these genera and am of the opinion that these names should be retained in order to promote clarity in the literature. In the case of *Glis*, a few American workers have recently decided to resurrect the name *Myoxus* for species usually known as *Glis*. I object to this resurrection and favor retention of the name *Glis* (and GLIRIDAE) for these rodents, whose fossil record can be traced into the Eocene. Retention of this name would result in nomenclatural stability and promote clarity in phylogenetic studies; retention would also discourage needless confusion in a fairly sizeable body of literature dealing with fossil and Recent members of the family GLIRIDAE. The opinions of not only Gentry but also Ellerman, Morrison-Scott, Corbet and others are correct: *Glis* should be retained.

(2) Keith Seaman

Hertfordshire and Middlesex Wildlife Trust, Grebe House, St Michael's Street, St Alban's, Hertfordshire AL3 4SN, U.K.

I am a Wildlife Ranger and am engaged in field studies on the status and distribution of the edible dormouse (*Glis* Brisson, 1762) and the otter (*Lutra* Brisson, 1762).

I fully support Gentry's application to the Commission to conserve 11 of Brisson's (1762) generic names for mammals. I find it quite ridiculous that after hundreds of years some workers feel the need to change the names of various taxa. I support the notion that stability needs to be brought into what is clearly a confusing situation. For us professionals and amateurs alike, having different names for the same species is absurd and can only be counter-productive. Why change accepted names of taxa without scientifically-proven biological reasons?